



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,149	03/02/2004	Jinzu Chen	26038	3030
20529	7590	07/12/2005	EXAMINER	
NATH & ASSOCIATES 1030 15th STREET, NW 6TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20005				LEE, Y MY QUACH
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2875		

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/790,149	CHEN, JINZU	
	Examiner Y Quach Lee	Art Unit 2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 to 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claims 1 and 6, line 8, there is no clear antecedent basis for "the side" and it should be changed to --a side--; and last line, the term "assembly" is incorrect and should be changed to --module-- in view of "A backlight module" as set forth on line 1 of claims 1 and 6. Claims 2 to 5 depend on objected claim 1 and as such are also objected. Claims 7 to 10 depend on objected claim 6 and as such are also objected. In claim 11, line 13, there is a typographical error such as the term "farme"; and last line, the term "assembly" is incorrect and should be changed to --module-- in view of "A backlight module" as set forth in claim 11. Claims 12 to 15 depend on objected claim 11 and as such are also objected. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 to 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al.

Kimura et al. disclose a back light module having a stack assembly including a supporting frame (24), a reflecting plate (36) and a light guiding plate (22), the supporting frame provided with at least one engaging element such as a hook type coupling element or a protrusion structure (32) and a recess (34), at least one lamp assembly (44) accommodated at one side portion of the light guiding plate, at least one side fixing frame (26) disposed at a side of the stack assembly where the lamp assembly is accommodated, the side fixing frame provided with a groove (the open space within and bounded by the fixing frame, figure 2), at least one counterpart (50) of the engaging element and a protrusion (52), the groove served for containing

the lamp assembly and fastening the stack assembly, the counterpart of the engaging element engaged with the engaging element of the supporting frame, and the protrusion engaged with the recess of the supporting frame with the side fixing frame fastening the stack assembly. However, Kimura et al. do not disclose that at least one optical film placed on the stack assembly in combination with the fixing frame constitutes the backlight module and that the recess is at each end of the supporting frame with the protrusion is at each end of the fixing frame.

It should be noted that to have at least one optical film placed on the stack assembly in combination with the fixing frame would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since it is known to place at least one optical film on top of the light guiding plate, the reflecting plate in combination with the frames to enhance the uniformity and brightness of the light from the guiding plate that passes through the liquid crystal display. It should also be noted that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to arrange the recess of Kimura et al. at each end of the supporting frame and to arrange the protrusion of Kimura et al. at each end of the fixing frame, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the location of the recess and the protrusion. A change in location to suite different applications is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

With regards to claims 2 and 3, the shape of the groove would have been an obvious matter of design choice since it does not affect the operation of the back light module and which provides no unusual, unobvious and/or unexpected result and is therefore deemed to fall within a purview of an ordinary engineering design technique to have the groove in any desirable shape including U shape or C shape to accommodate different applications.

5. Claims 6 to 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al.

Kimura et al. disclose a method of assembling a back light module comprising the steps of placing a reflecting plate (36) on a supporting frame (24), the supporting frame provided with at least one engaging element such as a hook type coupling element or a protrusion structure (32) and a recess (34), placing a light guiding plate (22) on the reflecting plate, disposing at least one lamp assembly (44) at one side of the light guiding plate to form a stack assembly, inserting at least one side fixing frame (26) at a side of the stack assembly where the lamp assembly is

accommodated, the side fixing frame provided with a groove (the open space within and bounded by the fixing frame, figure 2), at least one counterpart (50) of the engaging element and a protrusion (52), the groove served for containing the lamp assembly and fastening the stack assembly, the counterpart of the engaging element engaged with the engaging element of the supporting frame, and the protrusion engaged with the recess of the supporting frame. However, Kimura et al. do not disclose that placing at least one optical film on the guiding plate to complete the assembling of the backlight module and that the recess is at each end of the supporting frame with the protrusion is at each end of the fixing frame.

It should be noted to place at least one optical film on the guiding plate would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since it is known to place at least one optical film on top of the guiding plate to enhance the uniformity and brightness of the light from the guiding plate that passes through the liquid crystal display. It should also be noted that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to arrange the recess of Kimura et al. at each end of the supporting frame and to arrange the protrusion of Kimura et al. at each end of the fixing frame, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the location of the recess and the protrusion. A change in location to suite different applications is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

With regards to claims 7 and 8, the shape of the groove would have been an obvious matter of design choice since it does not affect the operation of the back light module and which provides no unusual, unobvious and/or unexpected result and is therefore deemed to fall within a purview of an ordinary engineering design technique to have the groove in any desirable shape including U shape or C shape to accommodate different applications.

6. Claims 11 to 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al.

Kimura et al. disclose a method of assembling a back light module comprising the steps of placing a reflecting plate (36) on a supporting frame (24), the supporting frame provided with at least one engaging element such as a hook type coupling element or a protrusion structure (32) and a recess (34), placing a light guiding plate (22) on the reflecting plate to form a stack assembly, placing a lamp assembly (44) in a groove (the open space within and bounded by the

fixing frame, figure 2) of a side fixing frame (26), the fixing frame (26) including at least one counterpart (50) of the engaging element and a protrusion (52), inserting the fixing frame in the stack assembly, the counterpart of the engaging element engaged with the engaging element of the supporting frame, and the protrusion engaged with the recess of the supporting frame. However, Kimura et al. do not disclose that placing at least one optical film on the guiding plate to complete the assembly of the backlight module and that the recess is at each end of the supporting frame with the protrusion is at each end of the fixing frame.

It should be noted to place at least one optical film on the guiding plate would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since it is known to place at least one optical film on top of the guiding plate to enhance the uniformity and brightness of the light from the guiding plate that passes through the liquid crystal display. It should also be noted that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to arrange the recess of Kimura et al. at each end of the supporting frame and to arrange the protrusion of Kimura et al. at each end of the fixing frame, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the location of the recess and the protrusion. A change in location to suite different applications is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

With regards to claims 12 and 13, the shape of the groove would have been an obvious matter of design choice since it does not affect the operation of the back light module and which provides no unusual, unobvious and/or unexpected result and is therefore deemed to fall within a purview of an ordinary engineering design technique to have the groove in any desirable shape including U shape or C shape to accommodate different applications.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cha et al. and Sakamoto et al. are cited to show other pertinent back light module assemblies for liquid crystal display panels.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Y Quach Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2373. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday and Thursday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2875

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is 571-272-2815.

Y.Q.
June 30, 2005



Y Quach Lee
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2875